

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 remain pending in the instant application. Claims 1-30 presently stand rejected. Claims 1, 5, 24, 25, 26, and 29 have been amended. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4). A corrected Figure 3 with block 322 correctly labeled is included.

Specification

The specification is objected to because it does not include a brief summary of the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection because CFR 1.77(b) and 1.73 state that the applicant “should include” a brief summary, which “should, when set forth, be commensurate.” Accordingly, the cited rules are suggestive and thus do not require a brief summary.

The specification has also been objected to for containing minor typographical errors. The specification has been amended to correct these and other typographical errors.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 5, and 24 are objected to because of informalities. Claims 25, 26, and 29 are objected to because of insufficient antecedent basis for limitation in the claims. Claims 25, 26, and 29 have been amended to correct the antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 8-20, 23-24, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goss et al. (US 2005/0044207, hereinafter Goss). Goss does not anticipate the amended claim because “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. “ MPEP §2131 (quoting *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif.*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). “The identical invention must be shown

in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” Id. (quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). Therefore, Goss must describe each and every element of the claims in order to anticipate these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). The Goss reference does not satisfy this requirement because Goss fails to teach, for example, “collecting information pertaining to service capabilities supported by each of a plurality of service processors.” Goss instead teaches a service processor that is capable of tracking status information of the operating system components (22:4-6) of a platform (15:16). The “system components” (20:1-9) are “elements of a platform-side operating system” and are thus not a service processor, as taught in Fig. 1. Thus Goss teaches a single (not a plurality) service processor that can track OS components (which are platform-side) and does not collect capabilities of each of a plurality of service processors.

Goss further fails to teach “aggregating the service capabilities of the plurality of service processors into an aggregated set of service capabilities” because the tracked status information is about the OS system components, rather than an aggregated set of service capabilities of the plurality of service processors. Goss also thus fails to display a unified presentation of service capabilities corresponding to the aggregated set of service capabilities to a service consumer.

Goss also fails to teach receiving from the user a command to select one of the plurality of the serial processors. (This amendment is supported by the instant application at page 18, lines 13-14, for example.) Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 15 is allowable because Goss fails to teach “aggregating service capabilities supported by each of a plurality of service processors” as discussed above.

Claim 24 is allowable because Goss fails to teach “aggregating service capabilities supported by each of a plurality of service processors” as discussed above. Furthermore, the executions are to be executed by the “main processor” as compared to Goss, which teaches service process execution in, for example, Figs. 2-4.

Dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons by which the claims they depend from are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goss, as applied to claim 1, in view of Spring (US 6,549,943, hereinafter Spring).

Claims 5, 22, and 25-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goss, as applied to claims 1, 15, and 24, in view of Chen et al. (US6,591,324, hereinafter Chen).

Claims 6-7 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goss in view of Chen, and further in view of Chrabaszcz (US 6,212,585, hereinafter Chrabaszcz).

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goss, with respect to claim 24, in view of Hawkins et al. (US 2003/0130969, hereinafter Hawkins).

“The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the result would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art. M.P.E.P. § 2143.01 (III). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

The combinations of references cited above do not cure the deficiencies of Goss. Goss has a publication date of Feb. 24, 2005, which is after the filing date of the instant invention. Thus, the record does not demonstrate that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have had the benefit of the teachings of Goss. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art could not have been motivated to modify Goss for any reason because Goss was not published at the time the invention was made. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejections of claims 2-4, 5-7, 21, 22, 25-26, and 27 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in

condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (206) 292-8600 if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: April 15, 2008

/Mark Hennings/

Mark R. Hennings
Reg. No. 48,982
Phone: (206) 292-8600

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California
94085-4040

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted electronically via EFS-Web to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

/Elizabeth J. Martinez/
Elizabeth J. Martinez

April 15, 2008
Date